SOCIAL CONTEXT AND THE IMPORTANCE OF RELIGIOUS FAITH IN THE LIVES OF AMERICAN TEENAGERS: AN EXPLORATION OF FAMILY, SCHOOL, AND GEOGRAPHY

Emily Elizabeth McKendry-Smith

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Sociology.

Chapel Hill
2007

Approved by:

Lisa D. Pearce

Christian Smith

Jacqueline Hagan

ABSTRACT

EMILY ELIZABETH McKENDRY-SMITH: Social Context and the Subjective Importance of Religious Faith in the Lives of American Teenagers: An Exploration of Family, School, and Geography
(Under the direction of Lisa D. Pearce)

This paper examines the relationship between three contexts -- family, school, and geography -- and the salience of religion for American adolescents above and beyond the frequency with which they attend religious services. Using ordered logistic regression and data from the National Study of Youth and Religion, I find that while select family, school, and geography variables are significantly related to adolescent religious salience, no school or geographic context variables are significant when combined with family context in a final model. This suggests that while all three contexts are capable of impacting adolescent religious salience, family, as the most proximate context, may have the strongest and most immediate influence. Chow tests reveal that the three contexts operate in similar ways for all religious traditions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis committee members, Dr. Lisa D. Pearce, Dr. Christian Smith, and Dr. Jacqueline Hagan, for their invaluable assistance over the course of my writing this thesis. Dr. Lisa Pearce, my advisor, continually pushed me to be ambitious and try new methods. Dr. Christian Smith and Dr. Jacqueline Hagan for challenged assumptions about religion and sociology in general. I am grateful to them all. In addition, I am thankful to Dr. Catherine Zimmer, Jessica Hardie, and Anne K. Hunter for their encouragement and help with the statistics used in this paper.

The National Study of Youth and Religion, whose data were used by permission here, was generously funded by Lilly Endowment Inc., under the direction of Christian Smith, of the Department of Sociology at the University of Notre Dame and Lisa Pearce, of the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER 1

CONTEXT AND RELIGION IN THE LIVES OF AMERICAN ADOLESCENTS

The religiosity of adolescents and young adults is a topic that has long interested both scholars of religion and sociologists. Because adolescence is often considered to be a particularly important time for the formation of both identities and habits, it is also thought of as a key period in the life course for the development and maintenance of religious beliefs and practices (Hastings and Hoge 1976; Ozorak 1989; Gorsuch 1988; Donelson 1999; King and Boyatzis 2004). While the teenage and young adult years are a time when many adolescents experience turmoil that may lead them to question or disavow their religious beliefs, it is also a period of the life course during which many youth do not experience any sort of 'crisis,' continue participation in the religious faiths they were raised in, or explore new forms of spirituality (Smith and Denton 2005).

There is ample evidence to suggest that religion plays a significant role in the lives of many American youth. Many teens have their lives overtly structured by religious institutions as they attend religiously affiliated high schools or colleges. Teen religion can play a role in how adolescents select the peers with whom they associate (see Martin, White and Perlman; 2003 for a discussion of religion and peer mediation); peers, in turn, can reciprocally influence teens' religiosity (Erickson 1992). In addition, religion has been associated with a variety of normatively-sanctioned outcomes for adolescents (Regnerus 2003). Religion has been associated with educational goals and academic

achievement (Regnerus 2000; Regnerus and Elder 2003), accumulation of social capital (Muller and Ellison 2001; Smith 2003), mother-child relationship closeness (Litchfield and Thomas 1997; Pearce and Axinn 1998), ego strength and school self-esteem (Markstrom 1999). Adolescent religiosity has been found to be related diminished use of narcotics and alcohol (Cochran 1993; Wallace and Williams 1997; Smith 2003), depression and suicide in youth (Donahue and Benson 1995), and youth sexual activity (Whitehead, Wilcox, and Rostosky 2001).

While the question of what youth outcomes religion is associated with is certainly worthwhile, in this research, I attempt to reverse this question and consider the different types of contexts and scenarios that lead to varying degrees of religiosity in adolescents. This paper will examine the role of three contexts of life on the salience of religion to adolescents over and above their level of religious participation. In other words, regardless of how often a youth attends religious services, how do the social contexts of his or her life shape how important religion is to him or her? The contexts I will focus on are family, school, and geography. In order to explore these questions, I use a longitudinal, nationally representative survey of American adolescents, the National Study of Youth and Religion.

Salience of Religion

This study focuses on adolescent religious salience, the extent to which someone personally finds religion to be important in his life. Numerous scholars have noted that personal religion is multidimensional (Glock 1962; Stark and Glock 1968; Nudelman 1971; King and Hunt 1975) and includes such components as public religiosity, service

attendance, private religious actions and devotions, personal belief of religious doctrines, and personal religious salience. Nudelman (1971) notes "the advisability of conceptualizing religiosity in terms of various aspects instead of assuming that one measure is the same as another and that all aspects of religiosity are similarly related to unrelated to other variables" (43). Nonetheless, studies of teenagers often focus solely on service attendance or combine multiple dimensions into an index, neglecting the possibility that different dimensions are related to different things (see Sloane and Potvin 1983; Gunnoe and Moore 2002 for examples, and Smith and Denton 2005 for an exception), as well as the possibility that because teenagers' public religiosity may not reflect teens' own ideas about religion. In this analysis, I examine personal religious salience as a phenomenon that has components that are distinct from other aspects of religiosity. I accomplish this by examining how contexts that adolescents live in are related to their religious salience, above and beyond the frequency with which adolescents attend church.

Religion and the Context of Family

In the large and diverse body of literature that addresses the religiosity of American youth, family and religion have been demonstrated to be reciprocally related in the lives of adolescents (Pankhurst and Houseknecht 2000). Religion is related to the family in that familial religiosity has been demonstrated to be related to a wide variety of family outcomes that are often considered desirable (Chatters and Taylor 1988; Ellison 1994; Howe 2002; Smith 2003; Smith and Kim 2003a and 2003b). However, in addition to religion affecting the family, family can have a marked impact on the religious beliefs

and practices of adolescents. Empirical research has documented three broad categories through which the family can influence youth religiosity. These include the family's religious characteristics, socialization into religion, and family relationships.

The religious tradition in which a youth is reared is significant for understanding family context and its impact on youth religiosity. Smith and Sikkink (2003) have demonstrated that the factors that predict if one will remain in a religious tradition or not are different for members of different traditions, illustrating that individuals' religious tradition is relevant to the religious choices made throughout their lives. In addition, religious rituals and discourse vary among different religious traditions and may influence the extent to which young adults find religion important in their everyday lives (Ammerman 1987 is an example of the unique religious practices and discourse of one group). Because youth are often reared in the religious traditions of their families, I expect parental religious tradition should be related to religious salience. As will be discussed subsequently, I believe that the particular historical origins and religious practices of conservative Protestants and Catholics are likely to render these groups distinctive from other religious traditions.

In addition to religious tradition, other family characteristics have been demonstrated to be related to adolescents' salience of religion. In particular, numerous studies have found that parental religiosity, including parental religious salience and service attendance, and teen religiosity are closely linked; Parental religiosity tends to be strongly and positively associated with adolescent religiosity (Hoge and Petrillo 1978; Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith 1982; Granqvist 1998; Smith and Denton 2005). Because parents often play an early and unique role in influencing children and exert some control

over what youths are exposed to, where they live, and what schools they attend, it stands to reason that parental religiosity is capable of exerting such a great influence on adolescent religiosity.

While family characteristics help shape teen religiosity, families also religiously socialize adolescents directly to varying degrees. Active parental socialization, such as parents discussing religion with their children and modeling religious behavior, has been found to be a significant predictor of teen religiosity, although religious socialization is a more useful predictor for female children than it is for males (Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith 1982).

Having two parents who hold similar religious beliefs has been found to be significantly and positively related to the transmission of religion from parents to their adolescent children (Hoge, Petrillo, and Smith 1982; Clark and Worthington 1987). It stands to reason that when the home does not serve as a religious "marketplace" (Stark and Finke 1989), the lack of competition might foster teen religious development. In addition, it is possible that religious congruence might foster the religious socialization of teenagers by their parents.

Finally, varying family relationships and relationship dynamics also influence the familial religious milieu in which teens live. Clark et al allude to this when they state that "marital and parent-child conflict can inhibit transmission of religious values to adolescents. Adolescents' perceptions of their families are often more important than the actual state of affairs" (Clark et al 1988; see also Acock and Bengtson 1980). This suggests that relationship quality, including both parental relationships and parent/child relationships, has the potential to influence adolescent religiosity. The relationships and

relationship disruptions precipitated by family structure also have this potential. Lawton and Bures (2001) note that "parental divorce in childhood weakens religious ties through its disruption of both family and community" (104).

In light of the above ideas regarding the influences of family on the religiosity of adolescents, I propose the following hypotheses for how the context of family influences the subjective importance of religious faith of American teenagers:

Hypothesis 1: Religious tradition will be related to adolescent subjective importance of religious faith; religious traditions will differ in the extent to which they are positively or negatively related to religious salience.

Hypothesis 2: Parental religious service attendance and subjective importance of religious faith will be positively related to adolescent subjective importance of religious faith.

Hypothesis 3: The more often parents discuss religion with their children, the higher these children's importance of religious faith will be.

Hypothesis 4: Family religious congruence, when teens are religiously similar to all of their parents, will be positively associated with importance of religious faith for adolescents.

Hypothesis 5: Influenced by parental relationship quality and lack of family disruption, adolescents who live with two biological parents who have high relationship quality will report higher subjective importance of religious faith.

Hypothesis 6: Parent/teen relationship quality will be positively related to teen importance of religious faith.

Religion and the Context of School

In additional to the family, schools have also been an important institution for socializing adolescents into religion. Educational institutions have been particularly important in the case of American Catholics, due to the large numbers of Catholic adolescents they once educated. For example, Byrne (2003) notes that in 1951, Catholic schools in the city of Philadelphia educated nearly 100 percent of Catholic grade-school

students and a third of all grade-school students in the city (12). Smith and Denton (2005) observe that while "Catholic schools and CCD[1] have historically been the primary vehicle for Catholic youth ministry and education" (211), "fewer than 15 percent of secondary-school-age Catholic teens in the United States now attend a Catholic school" (214). Cieslak (2005), observes that "historically these schools existed, at least in part, to acculturate new members into the Catholic Church. Today the Catholic laity seem to be uncertain not only about the school system's effectiveness in fulfilling this function, but about its very desirability" (185-6).

Despite the numbers of American adolescents who receive their educations from religious schools, previous research on religion and education has focused largely on the relationship between religious schools and academic performance and not on the relationship between religious schools and the religiosity of their students (Morrison and Hodgkins 1971; Noell 1982; Hoffer et al 1985; Willms 1985; Jensen 1986; Neal 1997; Morgan 2001; Eide et al 2004). In a review of research on American Catholics, Greeley (1969) notes that scholarship on Catholic education has largely concluded that "those who attended Catholic schools are more likely to be religious in adult life than those who did not, even when the religiousness of the family of origin is held constant" (355). Greeley defines adult religious behavior in this instance as continuing to identify as Catholic as an adult, attendance at religious services, and marriage to another Catholic (356).

In addition to the literature on Catholic education in the United States, there have also been a number of studies addressing Jewish schools. Gamoran and Boxer (2005)

[1] CCD refers to Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, a religious education program for Catholic youth, particularly those educated in public schools. Often, the CCD program ends after Catholic youth undergo the sacrament of Confirmation, which is celebrated at some time during adolescence.

conclude that “school conditions and family environments are independently associated with Jewish cultural capital as reflected in young persons' ritual performances, Jewish affiliations, and centrality of Jewishness” (457), although “adolescents' Jewish cultural capital appears more closely linked to their family environments than to their schooling experiences” (457). In another study on Jewish schooling, Himmelfarb (1977), finds that Jewish education is statistically significant to adult religiosity only when the student attends Jewish school for over 3,000 hours. However, after 4,000 hours, increased Jewish schooling does not increase religiosity (125). In measuring Jewish religiosity, Himmelfarb developed a measure of “total religiosity” that included observance of rituals, belief in Jewish doctrine, participation in Jewish organizations, association with other Jews as friends and neighbors, raising children as Jews, supporting the state of Israel, consumption of Jewish media, and charitable work (119).

Finally, many highly religious parents opt to homeschool their children. Parents who find public schools to be incongruous their own values and beliefs, such conservative Protestants, may choose to educate their children personally and in the home (Cai, Reeve, and Robinson 2002). Collom (2005) gives an overview of studies of homeschooling, concluding that “religious values and academic and pedagogical concerns are certainly prevalent” (311), but are not the sole reasons why children are homeschooled.

These studies suggest that attendance at religious schools and homeschooling are positively associated with aspects of religiosity. Based on these ideas, I offer the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 7: Attendance of religious school or homeschooling will be positively related to the subjective importance of religious faith for U.S. adolescents.

Religion and Geographic Context

At the most macroscopic level, all teens live out their lives in particular geographic contexts, such as nations, US states, counties, and communities. In addition to considering the more immediate contexts of families and schools, this paper also examines the geographic contexts in which adolescents live and their relationships with teen subjective importance of religious faith.

A number of authors who approach the study of American religion from a quasi-economic perspective have suggested that the number of religious congregations who "compete" in a religious "free market" economy can influence which congregations tend to grow and possess large memberships (Finke and Stark 1989). For example, Stark (1998) notes that "the less Catholic the context, the higher the level of commitment and the higher rates of innovation such as the admission of unordained men and women to leadership positions" (197). Silberstein et al (1987) have also found that context matters with regards to Jewish religiosity, while Zalenski and Zech (1995) have concurrent findings for Catholic, Episcopalian, Lutheran, and Methodist contexts.

Stepping aside from economic approaches, Bainbridge (1990) has found support for a geography-based theory that suggests church membership is lower in communities with higher levels of social instability. Additionally, Smith (1998) proposes a "subcultural identity" theory of religion that could apply to geographic region. In his discussion of American evangelicals, Smith writes that "evangelicalism is thriving, not because it has built a protective subcultural shield against secular modernity, but – to the contrary – precisely because it is passionately engaged in direct struggle with pluralistic modernity" (1998: 88). Smith goes on to suggest that religious groups are strongest when

they exist in an environment populated by many other religious groups and have been able to cultivate a strong subcultural identity. In this paper, I explore the geographic applicability of subcultural identity theory, hypothesizing that teens living in geographic regions where they are a religious minority will have greater religiosity than teens who are members of the dominant religious group. In addition this geographic interpretation of subcultural identity theory, I consider a number of other factors, such as regional milieu, rural environment, and number of area congregations in my analysis of geographic context.

With regards to religion in various regions of the country, the American South seems to be the geographic region that has most intrigued and captivated scholars. As early as 1962, Gaustad began an overview on religion and geography in the United States by ruminating on the existence of a "Bible Belt" in the South. More recently and specifically, Smith, Sikkink, and Bailey (1998) note that "among people who lived in the South at age 16, those who currently live in the South have a significantly higher religious commitment…than those who do not live in the South…Southerners who have out-migrated show a lower religious commitment than lifelong Southerners, while non-Southerners who have migrated into the South show a significantly higher religious commitment than their early-age counterparts who remained in their native non-South region" (502-3). These authors conclude that living or having lived in the South somehow leads individuals to have stronger religiosity over the course of their lives.

The South is also an interesting case for a number of specific religious denominations. In his comparison of Catholic dioceses, Stark (1998) finds it necessary to compare dioceses located in the South, a historically non-Catholic region, with non-

Southern dioceses. Meanwhile Grammich (n.d.) notes that Catholicism is growing in the South, aided by the migration of Latino and Hispanic Catholics. Interestingly, Grammich notes that "Southern Hispanics appear to be less Catholic than other Hispanics" (unpaginated, paragraph 14). Lippy (2005) notes that although evangelical Protestantism has long been dominant in the South, there is more religious diversity in that region than popular opinion would have one believe. These minority religious groups have developed unique strategies, such as intensive institution building, that have enabled them to survive and retain their religious identities. Lippy writes that when Seventh-day Adventists first arrived in the South, they constructed a training school and a health center, "symbols that secured the identity of a minority tradition" (2005: 127).

Despite not achieving prominence in American mythology comparable to that of the South, other American regions also have interesting religious dynamics. New England has traditionally been a home for mainline Protestants and is reported to be the most Catholic region in the United States (Walsh 2004: 12). However, O'Toole (2004) notes that despite their majority status in many New England states, Roman Catholics often hold a "minority mindset." Meanwhile, the American Midwest, in many respects, provides a religious microcosm of the United States as a whole; the Midwest is similar "in its proportion of adherents who are Catholic, Baptist, Holiness/Pentecostal, and those reporting no religious affiliation. It is closer than most regions to national rates of Muslims, Humanists, and unspecified Protestants" (Barlow 2004: 25). However, the Midwest is unique in that it has larger proportions of mainline Protestants and fewer members of Eastern religious groups and of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Barlow 2004).

The final United States census region, the West, is as notable for its lack of organized religion as it is for its religious adherents. Killen (2004) writes of this region that "fewer people in Oregon, Washington, and Alaska affiliate with a religious institution than in any other region of the United States. More people here claim 'none' when asked their religious identification than in any other region of the United States. And, unlike any other region, the single largest segment of the Pacific Northwest's population is composed of those who identify with a religious tradition but have no affiliation with a religious community" (Killen 2004: 9). The West census region is also home to a large concentration of members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints in the states of Utah and Idaho (Flake 2004). One of the most interesting relationships between the western United States and religion is explicated by Stark (1996), when he notes that while studies conducted elsewhere in the United States find a negative relationship between religion and delinquency, studies from the west coast do not find that relationship. As Stark notes, these studies demonstrate the "very potent contextual effect" that geography can have with respect to religion (1996: 163).

In addition to regional differences, religious differences between communities have also been documented at more local levels. Within census regions, the religious nature of different cities and communities can vary tremendously. Harper and Schulte-Murray (1998) offer the example of the Midwestern states of Iowa and Nebraska. Because Iowa has historically been a largely Protestant state, Catholic settlers formed Catholic enclaves. This differed dramatically from the Catholic experience in Nebraska, located immediately to the west of Iowa, where Omaha, Nebraska "was, and is still, an exceptionally 'Catholic' region of the country" (Harper and Schulte-Murray 1998: 104).

These examples of local differences suggest that community culture, density of religious adherents, and density of religious congregations are all factors that play important roles in the religious lives of community residents. Other analyses suggest that the local religious context can play a role in phenomena as wide-ranging as divorce rates, crime, and voting in local referenda (Mullins et al 2006; Beyerlein and Hipp 2005; Satterthwaite 2005). Despite this, however, empirical studies have tended to show a lack of support for more local effects on religiosity. While Regnerus, Smith, and Smith (2004) examine county-level factors in their study of context and religiosity, their analyses do not suggest that the county-level context plays a major role in determining religiosity. Finke and Sheitle (2005) note that analysis of local-level effects is often limited by over reporting of attendance at religious services and the problems collecting data on some denominations. Nonetheless, local communities can very greatly with respect to their religious atmosphere, and scholars need to attempt to continue teasing out the effects of those variations, despite the limitations of data.

Finally, both theory and research suggest that people living in rural areas may experience religion differently from those living in more urban or suburban locations. As described by Neitz (2005), rural religious institutions are often assigned a symbolic status where "due to their spatial location, close to nature, and perhaps far from urban areas, rural churches can be seen as carriers of something purer and closer to God" (243). Lee and Bartkowski (2004) note that religious institutions are key to the development of civic bonds in rural areas, particularly for members of historically African-American churches. Studies also suggest that rural areas frequently have higher levels of religiosity and that

this religion is more conservative in nature than in other areas (Chalfant and Heller 1991).

In accordance with the ideas outlined above, I have formulated the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 8: Adolescents residing in the South census region will exhibit greater subjective importance of religious faith than adolescents living in the Northeast or Midwest. Adolescents living in the West census region will exhibit lower levels of subjective importance of religious faith than teens from the Northeast or Midwest. Teens living in the Northeast and Midwest will exhibit similar levels of religiosity.

Hypothesis 9: The percentage of adherents to the teen's religious tradition residing in the county where the teen lives will be positively associated with teens' subjective importance of religious faith.

Hypothesis 10: The percentage of teen's county that is rural will be positively associated with teen subjective importance of religious faith.

Hypothesis 11: The density of religious congregations in the teen's county will be positively associated with the subjective importance of religious faith for teenagers at Wave 2.

Variations in Context by Religious Tradition

While previous research indicates that family, school, and geography are all social contexts that play important roles in the development of youth religiosity, there is also reason to believe that these contexts do not work in the same way for all religious groups. While theory and previous research indicate that family, school, and geography all help to religiously shape youth, the unique histories and practices of different religious traditions may shape how these processes operate.

Although previous scholarship suggests that family is a key influence on the development of religiosity for youth in many denominations, there are also reasons to suspect denominational differences in how family influences are played out. Edgell

(2006) notes that local religious congregations help to shape the meaning of family for people, defining familial roles, legitimating (or not) changes in the forms of families, and facilitating family transitions such as marriage. For example, Bartkowski and Xu (2000) and Wilcox (2004) all write that evangelical Protestant fathers engage in parenting practices that differ from those of fathers in other religious traditions. This variation in parenting practices may be related to differences in how religiosity is transmitted in evangelical families. Parental cohort may also impact the familial religious atmosphere. Carroll (2002) notes that many of today's young adults were reared by baby-boomer parents engaged in a "conspicuous quest for feel-good theology" (60). These cohort effects seem likely to vary in their impacts on different religious traditions; Smith and Denton (2005) note that the parents of Catholic teenagers tend to be less religious than parents from other religious traditions, a phenomena which may stem from their experiences of Vatican II and its changes to the Church. Additionally, Catholics may be impacted differently by familial disruption; Lawton and Bures (2001) find that parental divorce in childhood has a greater effect on the religious switching of Catholics than that of Protestants (106).

In terms of education, there are also reasons to suspect that experiences of religious schooling vary among different religious groups. In contrast to other religious groups such as Catholics or Jews, who tend to be more religious as they attend religious schools, evangelical Protestants have a religiously-charged relationship even with secular, public schools. Smith and Sikkink (2000) note that "evangelicals believe their 'presence' will have a positive impact…on teachers, parents, and children at school, and therefore on the schooling institution as a whole" (132-3). Smith and Sikkink write that

evangelicals feel "called" (136) to be present in public schools so that evangelical children will serve as a witness and positive influence for non-evangelical children. Evangelical Protestants may also believe that "public schooling provides Christian children with a needed time of trial so that their faith does not fall apart when they enter the 'real world'" (136). Sikkink (1999) also notes that while some religious groups, such as Pentecostal and charismatic Christians, prefer alternative education sources to public schooling, evangelical Protestants remain committed to public schools as a means of exhibiting their faith to non-evangelicals. In addition, religious schooling may serve to decrease religiosity for some denominations; Davidson et al. (1997) find that attending Catholic school seems to decrease religious devotion, although these results have been called into question by Perl and Gray (2007).

Finally, I suspect that the relationship between religion and geography may operate in different ways for different religious traditions. Similar to their relationship with public schools, we can expect evangelicals to "thrive" (Smith 1998) religiously in religiously diverse or secular environments. In addition, the geography heritage of religious traditions, such as the historic relationship between Catholics and Maryland (Dolan 1992) or the concentration of Mormons in Utah, may impact the way that some groups experience regional differences.

Individual Correlates of Religious Salience

In addition to social context, a number of individual-level characteristics are also relevant to the study of adolescent religiosity. Although I focus on social context here, I include these individual correlates in order to gain a more complete understanding of

adolescent religious salience. The individual factors that I consider include teen age, gender, race, immigration status, parental education, and parental income. In addition, although I focus on religious salience, a private religious phenomenon, I consider the relationship between salience and more public expressions of religiosity, such as attendance at religious services.

As noted previously, adolescence is a key time for the development of religiosity. However, as adolescents go through different stages of the life course, they experience religion differently. Teens at different ages undergo rituals such as confirmation or bar/bat mitzvah and spend more time outside the family home and in the company of peers. Because of these varying experiences, it is important to include age in studies of teen religiosity, as they may lead teens to experience religion differently.

In addition, scholars have long believed religiosity to differ according to gender. Stark (2002) notes that

> so far as it is known, throughout recorded history religious movements have recruited women far more successfully than men, except for those that excluded women from membership...that folklore has long classified religion as 'women's work' is well supported by denominational yearbooks and available religious census data: in every sizeable religious group in the Western world, women outnumber men, usually by a considerable margin (495).

Race and ethnicity have also been empirically related to religiosity and religious practices in the United States. While evangelical Christians strive for racial reconciliation, as noted by Emerson and Smith (2000), African-American evangelical Christianity has evolved separately from white evangelical traditions, reaching back to the days of slavery; today, the majority of religious congregations are racially homogamous (Emerson and Smith 2000; Emerson and Kim 2003). Historically, black

Christian congregations have been loci of African-American political action (McAdam 1999; Mattis 2001; Harris 2001) and have played important roles in shaping the family lives of their members (Lincoln and Mamiya 1990; Johnson and Staples 2005). This empirical research suggests that the meaning and practice of religion for African Americans has been distinctive from that of white Americans. Race and religiosity also may be intertwined for other racial/ethnic groups. Hernandez and Dudley (1990) note that the effect of family on youth religiosity "should be particularly strong in Hispanic families" (also see Griswold de Castillo 1984; Mirande 1985).

For many racial/ethnic groups, religious differences are also intertwined with immigrant status. Even after settling in the United States, religion and religious institutions in their countries of origin continue to play a role in the lives of immigrants (Tweed 1997; Levitt 2007). Hagan and Ebaugh (2003) note that religion serves as an important support during the migratory process; religious institutions, such as temples and churches, also play a supportive role once immigrants have arrived in the United States (Ebaugh and Chafetz 2000; Hirschman 2004). The relationship between immigration and religion may be relevant for youth who have not migrated themselves; many teens are second or third generation immigrants, the children or grand children of people who have migrated.

Finally, as noted in my discussion of religious salience earlier, religious salience is related to other aspects of religiosity, such as service attendance. To that end, I examine service attendance in this study in order to ascertain the relationship between religious salience and social context, regardless of the frequency with which teens attend services.

CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH DESIGN

Data

In these analyses, I employ data from Waves 1 and 2 of the National Study of Youth and Religion (NSYR), a longitudinal and nationally-representative survey of teenagers and their parents in the United States. During Wave 1 of the NSYR, 3,290 English and Spanish speaking teenagers ages 13 to 17 and their parents were interviewed between July of 2002 and April of 2003 (80 additional interviews were also completed to obtain a Jewish oversample; these data are not used here so as to facilitate the use of weights.) Teenagers and their parents were selected to be interviewed using random digit dialing of a sample of randomly generated telephone numbers representative of all household telephones in the fifty states. By basing the list of sample phone numbers on working household telephone exchanges, the NSYR was able to equally represent listed and unlisted telephone numbers. Households eligible to be interviewed included at least one teenager between ages 13 and 17 who resided in the house for at least six months out of the year. Interviewers asked to speak with the teen with the most recent birthday in order to randomize the teens who were interviewed. Parent interviews were conducted with either the teen's mother or father, although the survey asked to speak with mothers first. Ultimately, wave 1 of the NSYR had a response rate of 57 percent, determined via the AAPOR RR4 calculator. 96 percent of the households that completed parent interviews also completed teen interviews.

Data collection for wave 2 of the NSYR was conducted between June 2005 and November 2005. 78 percent of the original 3,370 teenagers were re-interviewed, giving the NSYR a cumulative response rate of 44 percent, a standard response rate for telephone surveys. For wave 2, only the youth respondents, then ranging from 16 to 21 in age, were re-interviewed.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable of interest in these analyses is an ordinal variable that measures adolescents' subjective importance of religious faith at the time of Wave 2 of the NSYR. Subjective importance of religious faith was measured using responses to the survey question "How important or unimportant is religious faith in shaping how you live your daily life?" Responses were reverse coded so that 1=not important at all, 2=not very important, 3=somewhat important, 4=very important, and 5=extremely important. Descriptive statistics for this variable, and all others used in analyses here, can be found in Table 1.

(Table 1 about here).

Family Context Variables

In the analysis of family context, I first employ a measure of parental religious tradition based on the categorization of religious traditions suggested by Steensland et al (2000). However, I do modify this variable in one key way. While Steensland et al's religious tradition variable contained a category for "Black Protestant," I have eliminated this category and divided the NSYR's parent respondents into the categories of conservative Protestant and mainline Protestant as appropriate. As I will explain in more

detail later, the category of “Black Protestant” is problematic for the geographic context analysis. My final religious tradition variable contains categories for conservative Protestant, mainline Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, other religion, and unaffiliated. These are incorporated into regression analysis as dummy variables, with mainline Protestant serving as the reference category.

The frequency with which parents attend religious services is the next independent variable I consider in these analyses. Parent attendance at religious services at the time of Wave 1 was measured using the question, “in the last 12 months, how often have you been attending religious services, not including weddings, baptisms, and funerals?” Responses to this question were reverse coded so that 1=never, 2=few times a year, 3=many times a year, 4=once a month, 5=two to three times a month, 6=once a week, and 7=more than once a week.

The next independent variable employed in the analysis of family context is parent subjective importance of religious faith at the time of Wave 1. Parent subjective importance of religious faith was determined by the response to the question, “How important is your religious faith in providing guidance in your own day-to-day living?” Responses to this question were reverse coded so that 1=not important at all, 2=not very important, 3=somewhat important, 4=fairly important, 5=very important, and 6=extremely important.

The following family context variable considers the relationship between family religious socialization and teens’ subjective importance of religious faith. Teens were asked “how often, if ever, does your family talk about God, the Scriptures, prayer, or other religious or spiritual things together?” Responses were reverse coded so that

1=never, 2=few times a year, 3=few times a month, 4=about once a week, 5=few times a week, and 6=every day.

Next, I employ a set of independent variables to examine the effect of parent-child religious congruence. Parent-child religious congruence was determined using the questions "would you say that your own religious beliefs are:" 1=very similar to your [mother], 2=somewhat similar, 3=somewhat different, and 4=very different from your [mother] and "would you say that your own religious beliefs are:" 1=very similar to your [father], 2=somewhat similar, 3=somewhat different, and 4=very different from your [father]. This question was asked using the phrase "religious beliefs" of teens who identified with a religion, and if Jewish-identified, did not report being only culturally Jewish. These questions were repeated using the phrase "your own ideas about religion" for teens who did not identify with a religion, as part of a particular religion/denomination/church, or who identified only as culturally Jewish. In addition, these questions were only asked who has a mother/female parent figure or father/male parent figure respectively. These questions were merged to create one variable about mothers and one on fathers. They were then recoded so that 1 (very similar) and 2 (somewhat similar)=religious congruence with mother/father and 3 (somewhat different) and 4 (very different)=religious dissimilarity with mother/father. Three dummy variables were then created. The first dummy variable, religious congruence, indicates that a teen has religious congruence with all of the parents in her household: both parents in a two-parent household and one parent in the case of a single-parent household. The second dummy variable, indicating a religiously mixed household, indicates a two-parent household in which the teen reports religious congruence with one parent (very similar or

somewhat similar) and religious dissimilarity with the other parent (somewhat different and very different). By virtue of its "mixed" nature, this dummy variable is only applicable to households with two parent figures. The final dummy variable, indicating the total absence of religious closure, indicates that the teen is religiously dissimilar from all the parents in his household: again, both parents in a two-parent household and one parent in the case of a single-parent household. I employ these dummy variables in a regression analysis with the dummy for teens religiously dissimilar to all parents as the reference category.

Following this, I consider the independent variables of parental relationship structure and parental marital quality. I divided family structures into four types – teens living with their two biological parents, teens whose families include at least one adult who is not their biological parent (referred to as 'other' two-parent families), biological single parents, and non-biological single parents (referred to as 'other' single parents). For the two-parent families, I then created variables indicating if parental relationship quality was high or low.

Parent respondents to the survey were asked "overall, how would you describe your marriage/relationship with your partner?" Responses were coded from 1 to 5 and included 1=very happy, 2 =somewhat happy, 3=neither, 4=somewhat unhappy, and 5=very unhappy. Parents who did not report having a partner were not asked this question. I then used these responses to construct dummy variables for high relationship quality, low relationship quality, and single parent. Parent respondents who reported being "very happy" or "somewhat happy" in their relationships were coded as having a high relationship quality. Parent respondents who reported "neither," "somewhat

unhappy," and "very unhappy" were coded as having low relationship quality. Family structure/parental relationship quality ultimately includes six dummy variables – two biological parents with high relationship quality, two biological parents with low relationship quality, two 'other' parents with high relationship quality, two 'other' parents with low relationship quality, biological single parents, and 'other' single parents. Because this category contains the largest number of cases, two biological parents with high relationship quality are used as the reference category.

Finally, I employ in these analyses a measure of parent/youth relationship quality. Depending on their family structure, teens were asked "generally, how well do you and your [mother] get along?" and/or a similarly phrased question regarding fathers. Responses were originally coded so that lower scores corresponded to better relationships and higher scores to worse relationships. For these analyses, I have reverse coded the variables so that 1=very badly, 2=pretty badly, 3=not so well, 4=fairly well, 5=very well, and 6=extremely well. For children of single parents, I consider their response to the question regarding their relevant parent. For teens with two parents, I have taken the average of their responses for mothers and fathers to achieve a measure of overall family atmosphere as it relates to parent/youth relationship quality. Data for children of single parents and children of two parents were then combined to create one ordinal variable describing how teens get along with all of their parents. This variable ranges from 1 to 6; however, because of the averages, it also contains values ending in .5. Teens in two parents families with responses of "don't know" or "refused" regarding one of their parents have been coded as missing. Descriptive statistics for all family context independent variables are presented in Table 1.

School Context Variables

The next group of independent variables examines the adolescents' experiences in the context of education. Parent respondents were asked if their teenager attended a private school, if that school was religious or not, and if so, "was it a Catholic, Lutheran, or Baptist school, another type of Christian school, or something else?" Based on this question, I created dummy variables indicating teenagers attending the following categories of schools: public, non-religious private, Catholic, other Christian, other religion, and homeschooled. These dummy variables were employed in an educational context regression model, with teens attending public school serving as the reference category. Descriptive statistics for these variables are available in Table 1.

Geographic Context Variables

The final grouping of independent variables examines the geographic contexts in which adolescents live. The first grouping of variables in the geography models pertains to the census regions in which teens lived at the time of Wave 1. The NSYR groups teens into four census regions: Northeast, Midwest, South, and West. These were used as dummy variables in regression analysis with Northeast serving as the reference category.

The second grouping of geography variables employs data from the 2000 Religious Congregations and Membership Survey (RCMS) conducted by the Glenmary Research Center. This dataset includes information on denominations' congregations, adherence, and attendance rates in each United States County for 149 denominations with congregations located in the United States. 285 denominations were initially invited to participate; responses from 149 denominations give the Religious Congregations and

Membership survey a response rate of 52 percent.[2] These county level measures of religious context were merged with the NSYR data by county in which the respondents resided at Wave 1.

Using the RELTRAD method developed by Steensland et al (2000), I grouped the denominations in the RCMS into the following groups: conservative Protestant, mainline Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, other religion, and unaffiliated[3]. My methods do depart from Steensland et al in one key area, however. These authors include a category of Black Protestant that encompasses members of historically Black denominations and Black members of conservative and mainline Protestant denominations. Because congregations and adherents per county do not possess race in the same way that individuals do, this is not useful for creating a RELTRAD variable out of the denominations in the RCMS; I have used their denominational affiliation to assign Black Protestants to the conservative Protestant and mainline Protestant categories, employing the methods used for the creation of RELAFF by Wave 2 of the NSYR. Using these RELTRAD groupings, I then created a variable measuring the percent of adherents of the respondent's religion in the county in which the respondent resides.

[2] The Glenmary Research Center notes that there are fourteen denominations with memberships over 100,000 who supplied information to the Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches but who did not participate in the RCMS. These include the African Methodist Episcopal Church, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, Baptist Bible Fellowship, Christian Brethren, Christian Congregation Inc., Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, Church of God in Christ, Full Gospel Fellowship of Churches and Ministers International, Jehovah's Witnesses, National Baptist Convention of America Inc., National Baptist Convention USA Inc., National Missionary Baptist Convention of America, Pentecostal Assemblies of the World Inc., and the Progressive National Baptist Convention Inc (Jones et al 2002).

[3] The unaffiliated population in counties was calculated by taking the percent of adherents in counties in the RCMS data and subtracting from the counties total population. While a number of counties in the RCMS dataset report percentages of adherents greater than 100 percent of the population, I have chosen to not manually correct these counties; I have made this choice in order to maintain the original distribution of the data. (See Jones et al 2002 xvi for additional information on over reporting in the RCMS data. See Finke and Sheitle 2005 and Killen 2004 for more sophisticated approaches to under and over-reporting in this dataset.) While this is a crude approach, the RCMS still provides a rich and valuable source of data on religious membership in the United States, as noted by Finke and Scheitle (2005).

The subsequent geographic context variable considers the extent to which the county the teen inhabits is rural as it relates to importance of religious faith. In doing this, I employed a measure of percent rural in county, which I obtained by merging data from the 2000 US census with the NSYR.

The final geography model considers number of congregations in the county where the teen lives per county population as its independent variable of interest. I create this variable by dividing the number of congregations in the county where a teenager resides, as reported in the Glenmary RCMS data, by the total population of that county, another variable included in the RCMS dataset. As with the other independent variables, descriptive statistics for the geography variables are provided in Table 1.

Control Variables

In addition to the independent variables described above, I included controls for respondent sex, teen age, race, immigration status, parental income, highest parental education, and frequency of religious service attendance. I also included a lagged dependent variable, respondents' subjective importance of religious faith at Wave 1, which is discussed below. Males were coded as 0 and females were coded at 1. Respondents' ages were reported in years, with ages ranging from thirteen to seventeen years old. Respondents were divided by race and ethnicity into four groups – white, black, Hispanic, and other/mixed race. These are included in regression models as dummy variables, with white teens serving as the reference category. Regarding immigrant status, I created three dummy variables. These included groups of teens who had been born outside the United States, teens who were born in the U.S. to at least one parent born outside the U.S., and teens born in the U.S. whose parents were also born in

the U.S. The latter category, with teens and parents both born in the United States, is used as the reference category in regression models. Parental income has been divided into five categories – annual income under $30,000 per year, between $30,000 and $50,000, between $50,000 and $80,000, $80,000 and higher, and teens for whom parental income is missing. These are used as dummy variables in regression models, with parental income between $30,000 and $50,000 serving as the reference category. Highest parental education has been divided into four categories – parents who have completed less than high school, high school graduates, parents who have completed some college, and parents with a college degree or higher; high school graduates serve as the reference category. Finally, teens were asked if, and how often, they attended religious services. These responses were coded similarly to parental service attendance so that 1=never, 2=few times a year, 3=many times a year, 4=once a month, 5=two to three times a month, 6=once a week, and 7=more than once a week. Descriptive statistics for these variables are located in Table 1.

Analytic Strategy

Because the dependent variable being examined is ordinal in nature, I have used ordered logistic regression. In addition, adolescents' subjective importance of religious faith at Wave 1 of the NSYR is included as a lagged dependent variable in these analyses. In this wave, teens were also asked the question "how important or unimportant is religious faith in shaping how you live your daily life?" Responses to this question were, again, reverse coded so that 1=not important at all and 5=extremely important. I model each family variable individually, along with my control variable, before creating a full family model that includes all family variables. I then repeat this process for my school

and geography variables and create a final full model that includes all independent variables. I have dealt with missing data via listwise deletion within each model.

Following the ordered logistic regression models, I have used chow tests to determine if regression coefficients for the same regression run on different samples are significantly different. In these analyses, I determine if the regression coefficients for my final model (which combines family, school, and geographic context) are significantly different across religious traditions. In doing this, I have used chow test procedure developed for Stata by Gould (2005).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The first model in Table 2 contains the control variables: importance of religious faith at Wave 1, frequency of teen's attendance at religious services, teen's race, parental income, highest level of education attained by a parent, teen's age in years, and teen's sex, operationalized as a dummy variable identifying female teenagers. Importance of religious faith at Wave 1, frequency of teen's religious service attendance, and the dummy variables indicating Hispanic teens and black teens are statistically significant in this model. Teens who reported being in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 1 are about three times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2 when compared to teens who reported being in a lower category at Wave 1. Similarly, teens who reported being in a higher category of frequency of service attendance are 1.2 times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 2. In addition, Hispanic teenagers are 1.65 times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2 than the reference category of white teenagers. Finally, black teenagers are about 2.18 times as likely as white teenagers to report being in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 2.

(Table 2 about here).

Family Models

In the first family model, I examine the relationship between parental religious tradition and teens' reported importance of religious faith at Wave 2. In addition to the independent variable of interest, I include the control variables in this model, as I will in all subsequent models. The independent variable of interest in this model, parental religious tradition, is operationalized as a set of dummy variables identifying parents whose religious tradition is conservative Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, an other religion, or unaffiliated. Mainline Protestant parents were used as the reference category. The only parental religious tradition that is statistically significant in this model is the dummy variable indicating teenagers with conservative Protestant parents. This indicates that teens whose parents are conservative Protestants are about 1.76 times as likely to report a higher importance of religious faith at Wave 2 than teens whose parents are mainline Protestants.

Similarly, in analyses not shown here, when Catholics are used as the reference group, teens whose parents are conservative Protestants are significantly more likely to be in a higher category than children of Catholic parents. When conservative Protestants are used as the reference group, adolescents with parents who are mainline Protestant, Catholic, or unaffiliated are all significantly less likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2. These variations in the reference group corroborate what the model using mainline Protestants as a reference group reveals – that adolescents with conservative Protestant parents tend to have a higher subjective importance of religious faith at Wave 2 than their Catholic, mainline Protestant, and unaffiliated peers. Alternating the reference group to teens with parents who are unaffiliated or belong to another religion also reveal differences related

to religious tradition, although these differences are difficult to meaningfully interpret as both the other religious and unaffiliated categories are ambiguous in their composition.

The second family model considers the frequency of parental attendance at religious services and its relationship to importance of religious faith at Wave 2. Teens whose parents have a one category increase in the frequency of church attendance are about 18% more likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2 than teens whose parents are in a lower category of church attendance. Unlike the original control model, in the second family model, the dummy variable indicating teenagers whose parents have at least a college education is significantly related to teen importance of faith at Wave 2; teens whose parents have obtained at least a bachelors degree are 0.75 times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith than teens whose parents highest education level consists of high school graduation. In addition, this model indicates that female teenagers are about 1.2 times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2 than their male counterparts.

Parental importance of religious faith is the independent variable of interest in the third family model. Teens whose parent's importance of faith increased by one category, such as from "not important at all" to "not very important," are about 30% more likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2 than teens whose parents were in a lower category of importance of faith. In addition, in contrast to the control model, female teenagers in family model 3 are about 1.2 times as likely as male teenagers to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2. Overall, these models suggest that teenagers whose parents attend religious services more frequently and have higher levels of religious salience tend to have higher levels of importance of faith.

The next family model examines the relationship between importance of faith at Wave 2 and how often parents and teenagers talk about religion. This model indicates that teens whose parent(s) talk to them about religion more often are about 30% more likely than teens whose parents discuss religion less often to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2; more generally, the model reveals that parental discussion of religion with adolescents is linked to higher adolescent religious salience. In this model, female teenagers are 1.2 times as likely as male teens to be in a higher importance of faith category, while older teens are 1.1 times as likely as younger teens.

In the fifth family model, the independent variable of interest is religious congruence between teenagers and their parents. This is operationalized as two dummy variables, one for teenagers who are religiously similar to all of their parents, and one for teenagers who are religiously similar to one of two parents. Teens who are not religiously similar to any parent are used as the reference category. Teenagers who consider themselves religiously similar to all of their parents are 69% more likely to report a higher importance of faith at Wave 2 than the reference category of teens who are religiously similar to none of their parents. Additionally, teens who are religiously similar to one of their two parents are 36% more likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2 than teens who are religiously similar to none of their parents. Unlike the control model, age is significantly related to importance of faith in family model 5; older teenagers are 1.06 times as likely as their younger counterparts to be in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 2.

The sixth family model elaborates the relationship between importance of religious faith and parental marital quality/the relationship between the teen's parent and the parent's

partner. In addition, these independent variables also take family structure into account. Of the five dummy variables examined in this model - two biological parents with poor relationship quality, two 'other' parents with high relationship quality, two 'other' parents with poor relationship quality, biological single parent, and 'other' single parent – two are statistically significant: the dummy variable indicating two 'other' parents with high relationship quality and the dummy variable indicating a biological single parent. Teens who have two 'other' parents whose relationship quality is high are 26% less likely to have a higher level of importance of faith at Wave 2 than the reference category of teens with two biological parents whose relationship quality is high. In addition, a teen with a biological single parent is 34% less likely to have a higher level of importance of religious faith at Wave 2 than a teen with two biological parents who have a high relationship quality. Ultimately, these results suggest that while parental relationship quality and family structure are both influential for adolescent religious salience, family structure is the more useful predictor of adolescent importance of religious faith. The control variable of teen sex and age are also related to importance of faith at Wave 2 in this model. At Wave 2, female teens are about 1.2 times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith as male teenagers and older teens are 1.06 times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith as younger ones.

In the seventh family model, I examine parent/youth relationship quality as it relates to importance of religious faith at Wave 2. Parent/youth relationship quality is not related to importance of faith at Wave 2 in a statistically significant way.

Finally, the full family model considers the relationship between importance of religious faith at Wave 2 and the full set of family context variables. As in the earlier model,

the only parental religious tradition variable that is statistically significant in this model is the dummy variable identifying conservative Protestant parents; teens whose parent identifies with the religious tradition of conservative Protestantism are 52% more likely than teens with mainline Protestant parents to be in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 2. Both parental service attendance and parental importance of faith continue to be strongly and positively related to importance of faith at Wave 2 independent of each other. Teens whose parents attend religious services more frequently are about 7% more likely than teens whose parents attend services less often to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2. Teenagers with parents who report being in a higher category of importance of faith are 14% more likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2 than teenagers whose parents reported being in a lower importance of faith category. Additionally, teens whose parents discuss religion with them more frequently are 19% more likely to be in a higher importance of faith category than teens whose parents broach the subject less often. One of the family religious congruence variables is also significant in the final family model. Teens who are religiously similar to both of their parents are 40% more likely than teens who are religiously similar to neither of their parents to be in a higher category of importance of faith. As in previous models, a number of parental relationship quality/family structure variables are also significant; teenagers with two 'other' parents whose relationship quality is high are 21% less likely than teens with two biological parents whose relationship quality is high to be in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 2. Teenagers with a single biological parent are 0.77 times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith as teens with two biological parents of high relationship quality. Finally, unlike the control model, the final family model indicates that female teenagers are about 1.3 times as

likely as male teens to be in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 2 and that older teens are 1.06 times as likely as younger teens. In addition, teenagers whose parent(s) have a bachelor's degree or higher are 0.77 times as likely as teens whose parents are high school graduates to be in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 2.

School Model

In the school model, the independent variables of interest consider the relationship between importance of religious faith at Wave 2 and the type of school teenagers attended at Wave 1: private and non-religious, Catholic, other Christian, other religious, a home school, or public school. The only school-type variables that are found to be statistically significant are the dummy variables identifying teens who attended other Christian schools and teens who were homeschooled at Wave 1. Teenagers who were attending a Christian school at Wave 1 are 80% more likely to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2 than teenagers who were attending a public school at Wave 1. Teens who were homeschooled at Wave 1 are 2.13 times as likely as teens who attended public school to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2. Unlike the original control model, age is significant in the school model; older teenagers are 1.06 times as likely as younger teens to be in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 2.

(Table 3 about here).

Geography Models

In the first geography model, I examine the relationship between the census region in which teenagers lived at Wave 1 and their reported importance of religious faith at Wave 2. I

consider the census regions of the Midwest, South, and West in this model, using the Northeast as the reference category. The South is the only census region that differs from the Northeast in a way that is statistically significant. Teenagers residing in the South at Wave 1 are 27% more likely than teens living in the Northeast to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2. Rotating the comparison group, in analyses not shown here, reveals that the Northeast and South are the only two census regions that differ from each other significantly in terms of teen importance of religious faith.

In the next geography model, the independent variable of interest is the percentage of the county in which the teen lives that are members of the same religious tradition as the teen's parents. In this model, this variable is not found to have a statistically significant relationship with teens' importance of religious faith at Wave 2.

In the third geography model, I consider the relationship between importance of religious faith at Wave 2 and the percentage of the county that the teen lives at Wave 1 that is rural. This independent variable is found to be statistically significant. Each one percent increase in the rural of the population of a teen's county is associated with teens being about51% more likely than teens residing in less rural areas to be in a higher category of importance of faith.

The fourth geography model employs as the independent variable under analysis the number of religious congregations in counties where teenagers reside, divided by the counties' populations. Again, this variable is found to be statistically significant. Teenagers residing in counties where there are more congregations per capita are 1.01 times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of religious faith at Wave 2 as teens whose congregations per capita ratio is not as dense.

In the final geography model, I consider the effects of all the geographic factors in concert. When analyzed together, none of the geographic independent variables attain statistical significance.

Final Model

In the final model, I consider the relationship between all three contexts – family, school, and geography – and teenagers' self-reported importance of religious faith at Wave 2. The four control variables that had been statistically significant in the control model, importance of faith at Wave 1, frequency of attendance at religious services, and dummy variables identifying Hispanic and black teenagers; these all continue to be positively related to importance of religious faith at Wave 2. In addition, the control variables regarding teen gender and age are also statistically significant in the full model. Female teenagers are about 1.29 times as likely as male teenagers to be in a higher category of importance of faith at Wave 2, while older teens are 1.06 times as likely their younger counterparts to be in a higher category.

(Table 4 about here).

When considering the family context variables in the full model, several variables that were statistically significant in the full family model continue to be significant in the final model. These include the dummy variable indicating teenagers with parents who are conservative Protestants, parental church attendance, parental importance of faith, frequency with which parents and teens discuss religion, and the dummy variables indicating teens with religious beliefs similar to those of all their parents, teens with two 'other' parents whose relationship quality is high, and teens with a biological single parent.

Similarly, while the dummy variables indicating teens who attended Christian schools and teens who were homeschooled had been statistically significant in the school context model, these are no longer significant in the final model.

Regarding the context of geography, the dummy variable indicating whether or not the teen's parents were members of the largest religious tradition in their county had been statistically significant in the full geography model; this variable is not significant in the final model. However, the variable indicating the percentage of the teen's county who are adherents of the teen's parents' religious tradition is statistically significant in the final model. When the number of residents of the teen's county who are members of the teen's parents' religious tradition is increased by one percentage point, teens are about 1.01 times as likely to be in a higher category of importance of religious faith.

Comparison of Religious Traditions

Following the ordered logistic regression, I performed Chow tests to compare the operation of the final model for different religious traditions. A comparison between mainline Protestants and unaffiliated teens is not included, as limited variance prohibited Chow tests from being performed comparing these two groups.[4] The Chow test results, shown in Table 5, indicate that the processes captured in the final model are different for Catholics as compared to mainline Protestants. However, because one of the covariates for mainline Protestant teens is predicted completely for the full model, it seems possible that this result is not very robust. The Chow tests do not indicate significant differences in how the final model operates between any other groups.

(Table 5 about here).

[4] The chow test procedure in Stata, developed by Gould (2005), involves interacting the religious tradition being tested with all variables in the model, in this case producing a model with nearly seventy-five variables.

Discussion

Regarding the impact of contexts on teen religious salience, these results indicate that all three of the contexts in which teenagers live, family, school, and geographic location, have the capacity to influence the extent to which they consider religion to be important. While there may be some differences in how these contexts effect adolescents from different religious traditions, Chow tests reveal that overall, the model containing all three contexts seems to work equally well for teenagers from all religious backgrounds.

In terms of family context, these results indicate that the contextual phenomena of parental religious tradition, attendance at religious services, and importance of faith, family discussion of religion, familial religious congruence and family structure are all significant in shaping adolescent subjective importance of religious faith over time. These findings are in line with Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Some aspects of the family environment, however, do not seem to be as key influences on the importance of faith for teenagers. These include parent/teen relationship quality and parental relationship quality; results suggest that family structure is more useful than parental relationship satisfaction in determining teen subjective importance of religious faith.

Regarding the context of schools, while religious schooling does shape teen importance of religious faith, certain types of religious schooling are more influential than others; these include both homeschooling and attending a non-Catholic Christian school. It seems possible that these types of schooling that may be associated with particular religious traditions are more effective than other types in precipitating higher subjective importance of religious faith in teenagers. In addition, all religious school variables are not found to be

significant in the final model, suggesting that other factors also play a role in mediating the relationship between religious school attendance and teen importance of faith.

In terms of the geographic context, living in the South census region, a rural area, or in an area where there is a high ratio of congregations per population are all shown to influence teen importance of faith when considered solely with other geographic factors but are no longer significant when combined with the family and school contexts. In contrast, the percentage of the teen's county composed of adherents of the teen's religion is significant only when analyzed in conjunction with family and school. This indicates that the relationship between percent of adherents and adolescent importance of faith may be mediated by one of the family or school context phenomena.

The disappearance of several school and geography variables from the final model indicates that the effects of these contexts are not as strong as the more immediate influence of the family. This seems reasonable in light of the fact that teens' exposure to their families exceeds that of school or the broader geographic area, and that families are influential in determining where teens attend school and what sort of area in which the teen resides. These results are also in keeping with previous studies, which find that the family is a particularly key influence on teen religiosity. Nonetheless, the school and geographic milieus in to which families place teenage children have the capacity to shape how these teenagers think about religion.

Regarding comparisons among religious traditions, I suggest that the processes captured in the final model may operate differently for some religious traditions than others. However, comparison via Chow tests revealed differences only between Catholics and mainline Protestants. Catholics and mainline Protestants do no appear significantly different

from any other religious traditions, nor do any other religious traditions appear significantly different from each other. As noted previously, the presence of a completely determined variable for mainline Protestants suggests that these results may not be robust. While other scholars have documented key differences between religious traditions, these analyses suggest that the final model works equally well for adolescents from all religious backgrounds.

In terms of future research, more work is required in order to fully understand the relationship between social context and teen religiosity. While these analyses indicate the importance of context and begin to convey the ways in which contexts affect teen importance of religious faith, more research will undoubtedly reveal more about the ways and mechanisms through which context relates to religiosity. These data are limited in a number of respects; most significantly in that the context of peers is not analyzed. The religiosity of peers that teens interact with in school and activities and as friends may influence the effects of the school context, in addition to being important in their own right. This analysis of the context of geography is also somewhat constrained. In addition to the limitations of the Glenmary RCMS data, I was unable to incorporate data from states, cities, and "neighborhoods," that might be more meaningful for individuals than their counties.

Nonetheless, these analyses serve to further the study of religion in a number of respects. By analyzing subjective importance of religious faith while controlling for service attendance, I have attempted to untangle the relationship between these two phenomena. The fact that the effects of contextual factors are evident even when controlling for attendance suggests that attendance and salience are two distinct phenomena that may be influenced by different factors and that should not be combined into indices unthinkingly. In addition,

although a large body of research on the religiosity of adolescents exists, much of this focuses on the impact of religion on adolescents' behaviors. Through analysis of social context here, I consider the environments adolescents live in and their potential to shape them religiously; before teens set foot in a place of worship, their family and other contextual factors may have begun to influence their ideas about religion and its importance. By examining these contexts, we gain a better understanding of the world adolescents inhabit as it relates to religion.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
# of congregations in county/county population	10.50	7.66	3.20	73.92
% rural in teen's county	0.25	0.27	0	1
% adherents of teen's religion in county	23.39	17.98	0	88.15
Census Regions				
Midwest	0.24	0.43	0	1
South	0.41	0.49	0	1
West	0.20	0.40	0	1
Northeast	0.15	0.36	0	1
School Type				
Non-religious private school	0.02	0.13	0	1
Catholic school	0.04	0.20	0	1
Other Christian school	0.02	0.15	0	1
Other religious school	0.01	0.10	0	1
Homeschooled	0.02	0.15	0	1
Public school	0.88	0.32	0	1
Parent/youth relationship quality	4.80	0.77	1	6
Family structure/parental relationship quality				
2 bio parents: rel. quality poor	0.03	0.17	0	1
2 other parents: rel. quality good	0.18	0.39	0	1
2 other parents: rel. quality poor	0.01	0.10	0	1
Bio single parent	0.23	0.42	0	1
Other single parent	0.02	0.14	0	1
2 bio parents: rel. quality good	0.53	0.50	0	1
Family Religious Congruence				
Teen has religious views similar to all parents	0.63	0.48	0	1
Teen has religious views similar to 1 of 2 parents	0.14	0.35	0	1
Teen has religious views not similar to any parents	0.14	0.42	0	1
How often family talks about religion	3.34	1.73	1	6
Parent importance of faith at W1	5.00	1.28	1	6
Parent church attendance	4.39	2.20	1	7
Parental Religious Tradition				
Conservative Protestant	0.45	0.50	0	1
Catholic	0.23	0.42	0	1
Jewish	0.02	0.14	0	1
Other Religion	0.05	0.22	0	1
Unaffiliated	0.08	0.27	0	1
Mainline Protestant	0.16	0.37	0	1

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for All Variables, contd.

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Sex: female	0.50	0.50	0	1
Age (in years)	14.99	1.39	13	17
Highest Parental Education				
Less than HS graduate	0.04	0.20	0	1
Some college	0.38	0.48	0	1
College graduate or higher	0.41	0.49	0	1
HS graduate	0.17	0.38	0	1
Income				
< $30,000	0.20	0.40	0	1
$50 – 80,000	0.27	0.44	0	1
> $80,000	0.22	0.41	0	1
Missing	0.06	0.23	0	1
$30 – 50,000	0.26	0.44	0	1
1st generation immigrant	0.04	0.19	0	1
Race/ethnicity of teenager				
Black	0.16	0.37	0	1
Hispanic	0.10	0.30	0	1
Other/mixed	0.05	0.22	0	1
White	0.69	0.46	0	1
Religious service attendance	4.22	2.19	1	7
Importance of faith at Wave1	3.30	1.22	1	5
Importance of faith at Wave 2	3.46	1.13	1	5

Table 2. Ordered Logistic Regression Results for Family Models

Variables	Control Model	Family Model 1	Family Model 2	Family Model 3	Family Model 4	Family Model 5	Family Model 6	Family Model 7	Full Family Model
Parent/youth relationship quality								1.00	0.99
								(0.05)	(0.05)
Family structure/parental relationship quality									
2 bio parents:							0.85		0.91
rel quality low							(0.19)		(0.20)
2 other parents:							0.74**		0.79*
rel quality good							(0.08)		(0.08)
2 other parents:							0.64		0.78
rel quality low							(0.24)		(0.30)
Bio single parent							0.66***		0.77*
							(0.07)		(0.08)
Other single parent							0.70		0.78
							(0.21)		(0.23)
2 bio parents:							---		---
rel quality good									
Family Religious Congruence									
Teen has rel.						1.69***			1.43***
views similar to all parents						(0.17)			(0.15)
Teen has rel. views						1.36*			1.29
similar to 1 of 2 parents						(0.18)			(0.17)
Teen has rel. views						---			---
not similar to any parents									
How often family talks about religion					1.26***				1.19***
					(0.03)				(0.03)
Parent importance of faith at W1				1.30***					1.14***
				(0.04)					(0.05)
Parent church attendance			1.18***						1.07*
			(0.03)						(0.03)
Parental Religious Tradition									
Conservative Prot.		1.76***							1.52***
		(0.20)							(0.18)
Catholic		1.13							1.16
		(0.14)							(0.15)
Jewish		1.14							1.41
		(0.32)							(0.40)
Other Religion		1.44							1.19
		(0.29)							(0.25)
Unaffiliated		0.90							1.24
		(0.15)							(0.22)
Mainline Protestant		---							---
N	2496	2496	2493	2490	2481	2477	2463	2494	2420

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

Table 2. Ordered Logistic Regression Results for Family Models, contd.

Variables	Control Model	Family Model 1	Family Model 2	Family Model 3	Family Model 4	Family Model 5	Family Model 6	Family Model 7	Family Model 8	Full Family Model
Sex: female	1.12	1.14	1.19*	1.16*	1.22**	1.15	1.17*	1.19*	1.13	1.31***
	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.10)
Age (in years)	1.05	1.05	1.04	1.05	1.06*	1.06*	1.06*	1.07*	1.05	1.06*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Highest parent education										
Less than	1.02	0.97	1.00	1.01	0.97	1.10	1.05	1.13	1.02	1.03
HS	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.22)
Some	0.91	0.88	0.86	0.84	0.87	0.91	0.93	0.93	0.90	0.83
college	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.09)
College	0.85	0.87	0.75*	0.80	0.79	0.85	0.86	0.87	0.85	0.77*
grad. +	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.09)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.10)
HS grad	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Income										
< $30,000	1.03	1.02	1.03	1.03	0.99	1.02	1.10	1.09	1.04	1.04
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.13)
$50 –	1.11	1.14	1.11	1.14	1.15	1.11	1.03	1.02	1.12	1.11
80,000	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)
> $80,000	0.96	1.02	1.00	1.01	1.00	0.95	0.86	0.85	0.96	1.00
	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.13)
Missing	1.02	1.04	0.99	0.98	0.99	1.00	0.97	0.96	1.02	0.95
	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)
$30 – 50,000	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
1st gen.	0.84	0.88	0.80	0.81	0.78	0.84	0.83	0.82	0.84	0.78
immigrant	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.16)
Race/ethnicity of teenager										
Black	2.18***	1.89***	1.95***	1.98***	1.83***	2.22***	2.37***	2.39***	2.19***	1.72***
	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.25)	(0.27)	(0.27)	(0.24)	(0.21)
Hispanic	1.65***	1.83***	1.55***	1.59***	1.58***	1.67***	1.75***	1.77***	1.65***	1.72***
	(0.22)	(0.26)	(0.21)	(0.22)	(0.22)	(0.23)	(0.24)	(0.24)	(0.22)	(0.25)
Other	1.14	1.17	1.14	1.11	1.11	1.21	1.15	1.21	1.14	1.16
	(0.19)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.19)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.20)
White	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Church attendance	1.21***	1.19***	1.11***	1.16***	1.16***	1.20***	1.20***	1.20***	1.21***	1.10***
	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)
Importance of faith at W1	3.09***	2.97***	3.01***	2.91***	2.81***	2.95***	3.09***	2.95***	3.08***	2.63***
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.13)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.13)
Log likelihood	- 3160.74	- 3141.31	- 3128.29	- 3122.37	- 3094.50	- 3121.78	- 3110.59	- 3073.32	- 3158.28	- 2975.55
N	2496	2496	2490	2490	2481	2477	2463	2444	2494	2420

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests)

Table 3. Ordered Logistic Regression Results for School and Geography Models

Variables	School Model	Geography Model 1	Geography Model 2	Geography Model 3	Geography Model 4	Full Geo. Model
# of congs in county/county's population					1.01** (0.01)	1.00 (0.01)
% rural in teen's county				1.51** (0.22)		1.33 (0.30)
% adherents of teen's religious trad. in county			1.00 (0.002)			1.00 (0.002)
Census Region						
Midwest		1.09 (0.13)				1.06 (0.13)
South		1.27* (0.14)				1.21 (0.14)
West		1.19 (0.15)				1.21 (0.16)
Northeast		---				---
School Type						
Non-religious private school	0.92 (0.25)					
Catholic school	0.74 (0.14)					
Other Christian school	1.80* (0.46)					
Attends other religious school	0.74 (0.30)					
Homeschooled	2.13** (0.56)					
Public school	---					

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests)

Table 3. Ordered Logistic Regression Results for School and Geography Models, contd.

Variables	School Model	Geography Model 1	Geography Model 2	Geography Model 3	Geography Model 4	Full Geo. Model
Sex: female	1.13	1.13	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.13
	(0.09)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.08)
Age (in years)	1.06*	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.05
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)
Highest Parental Education						
Less than HS graduate	1.04	1.01	1.02	1.03	1.03	1.03
	(0.22)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)	(0.21)
Some college	0.89	0.90	0.91	0.92	0.92	0.92
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)
College graduate or higher	0.85	0.85	0.86	0.88	0.88	0.89
	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.11)
HS graduate	---	---	---	---	---	---
Income						
< $30,000	1.02	1.02	1.03	1.03	1.02	1.01
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)
$50 – 80,000	1.13	1.11	1.12	1.14	1.14	1.13
	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)
> $80,000	0.98	0.96	0.96	1.01	0.99	1.01
	(0.12)	(0.11)	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.12)	(0.12)
Missing	1.00	1.02	1.02	1.06	1.06	1.07
	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.18)
$30 – 50,000	---	---	---	---	---	---
Teen is a 1st generation immigrant	0.84	0.85	0.84	0.86	0.86	0.88
	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.17)	(0.18)
Race/ethnicity of teenager						
Black	2.25***	2.15***	2.22***	2.35***	2.32***	2.34***
	(0.25)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.26)	(0.26)	(0.27)
Hispanic	1.70***	1.63***	1.65***	1.81***	1.80***	1.75***
	(0.23)	(0.23)	(0.22)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.25)
Other/mixed	1.16	1.13	1.15	1.19	1.19	1.17
	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.20)
White	---	---	---	---	---	---
Church attendance	1.21***	1.21***	1.21***	1.21***	1.20***	1.20***
	(0.25)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)
Importance of faith at W1	3.05***	3.05***	3.10***	3.08***	3.07***	3.05***
	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)	(0.14)
Log likelihood	-3147.67	-3157.98	-3158.58	-3155.07	-3155.35	-3152.53
N	2492	2496	2495	2495	2495	2495

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests)

Table 4. Ordered Logistic Regression Results for Final Model

Variables	Final Model
# of congs. in county/county's pop.	1.00
	(0.01)
% rural in teen's county	1.25
	(0.29)
% adherents of teen's religion in county	1.01*
	(0.003)
Census Region	
Midwest	1.12
	(0.14)
South	1.22
	(0.15)
West	1.25
	(0.17)
Northeast	---
School Type	
Private non-religious school	0.88
	(0.25)
Catholic school	0.89
	(0.18)
Other Christian school	1.47
	(0.39)
Other religious school	0.62
	(0.27)
Homeschooled	1.49
	(0.40)
Public school	---
Parent/youth relationship quality	0.98
	(0.05)
Family structure/parental relationship quality	
2 bio parents: rel. quality low	0.93
	(0.21)
2 other parents: rel. quality good	0.80*
	(0.09)
2 other parents: rel. quality low	0.82
	(0.31)
Bio single parent	0.80*
	(0.09)
Other single parent	0.82
	(0.25)
2 bio parents: rel. quality good	---
Family Religious Congruence	
Teen has religious views similar to all parents	1.42***
	(0.15)
Teen has religious views similar to 1 of 2 parents	1.26
	(0.17)
Teen has religious views not similar to any parents	---
How often family talks about religion	1.19***
	(0.03)
Parent importance of faith at W1	1.14***
	(0.05)
Parent church attendance	1.07**
	(0.03)
N	2415

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests)

Table 4. Ordered Logistic Regression Results for Final Model, contd.

Independent Variables	Final Model
Parental Religious Affiliation	
Conservative Protestant	1.38**
	(0.17)
Catholic	1.10
	(0.15)
Jewish	1.64
	(0.48)
Other	1.15
	(0.25)
Unaffiliated	0.95
	(0.21)
Mainline Protestant	---
Sex: female	1.29***
	(0.10)
Age (in years)	1.06*
	(0.03)
Highest parental education	
Less than HS graduate	1.05
	(0.23)
Some college	0.83
	(0.10)
College graduate or higher	0.78
	(0.10)
HS graduate	---
Teen is a 1st gen. immigrant	0.82
	(0.17)
Race/ethnicity of teenager	
Black	1.89***
	(0.24)
Hispanic	1.73***
	(0.26)
Other/mixed	1.18
	(0.21)
White	
Church attendance	1.09***
	(0.03)
Importance of faith at W1	2.61***
	(0.13)
Log likelihood	-2960.83
N	2415

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests)

Table 5. Chow Test Results

Religious Tradition	Conservative Protestant	Mainline Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	Other Religion
Mainline Protestant	41.13				
Catholic	43.68	57.85*			
Jewish	25.87	42.26	36.46		
Other Religion	48.23	45.94	53.24	31.88	
Unaffiliated	33.18	---	46.92	38.63	44.89

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ (two-tailed tests)

APPENDIX 1:

RELTRAD Categorization of RCMS Denominations

RCMS denominations included in "conservative Protestant": Allegheny Wesleyan Methodist Connection; American Baptist Association, Amish, Apostolic Christian Churches (Nazarene); Apostolic Christian Churches of America Inc.; Assemblies of God; Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church; Baptist General Conference; Baptist Missionary Association of America; Beachy Amish Mennonite Churches; Bruderhof Communities; Brethren Church (Ashland, OH); Brethren in Christ Church; Calvary Chapel Fellowship Churches; Christian and Missionary Alliance; Christian Churches and Churches of Christ; Christian Reformed Church in North America; Christian Union; Church of God, General Conference; Church of God (Anderson, IN); Church of God (Cleveland, TN); Church of God in Christ, Mennonite; Church of God of Prophesy; Church of the Brethren; Church of the Nazarene; Churches of Christ; Churches of God, General Conference; Conservative Baptist Denomination of America; Conservative Congregational Christian Conference; Conservative Mennonite Conference; Cumberland Presbyterian Church; Duck River and Kindred Baptists Association; Enterprise Baptists Association; Evangelical Convanent Church; Evangelical Free Church of America; Fellowship of Evangelical Bible Churches; Evangelical Mennonite Church; Evangelical Presbyterian Church; Association of Free Lutheran Congregations; Free Methodist Church of North America; National Association of Free Will Baptists; Fundamental Methodist Conference Inc.; U.S. Conference of Mennonite Brethren Churches; General Six Principle Baptists; Hutterian Brethren; Independent Free Will Baptists Associations; International Council of Community Churches; International Church of the Foresquare Gospel; International Churches of Christ; International Pentecostal Church of

Christ; Interstate and Foreign Landmark Missionary Baptist Association; Jasper Baptist and Pleasant Valley Baptist Association; Landmark Missionary Baptists, Independent Association; Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod; Eastern Pennsylvania Mennonite Church; Mennonite Church USA; New Hope Baptist Association; Missionary Church; Midwest Congregational Christian Fellowship; Mennonite; New Testament Association of Independent Baptists; Netherlands Reformed Congregations; North American Baptist Conference; Old Missionary Baptist Associations; Old Order Mennonite; Old Order Amish; Old Order River Brethren; Orthodox Presbyterian Church; Original Free Will Baptists; Pentecostal Church of God; Presbyterian Church in America; International Pentecostal Holiness Church; Primitive Baptist Church; Primitive Baptists, Eastern District Association; Primitive Methodist Church in the USA; Progressive Primitive Baptists; Reformed Baptist Churches; Reformed Mennonite Church; General Association of Regular Baptist Churches; Salvation Army; Separate Baptists in Christ; Seventh Day Adventist Church; Southwide Baptist Fellowship; Southern Baptist Convention; Strict Baptists; Two-seed-in-the-spirit Predestinarian Baptists; United Reformed Churches in North America; Vineyard USA: Wayne Trail Missionary Baptist Association; Wesleyan Church; Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod; National Primitive Baptist Convention; Independent Charismatic Churches; Independent Non-Charismatic Churches

RCMS denominations included in "mainline Protestant": American Baptist Churches in the USA; Christian Church (Disciples of Christ); National Association of Congregational Christian Churches; Additional Congregational Christian Churches; Episcopal Church; Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; Congregation of Friends/Quakers; Metropolitan

Community Church; Moravian Church in America, Alaska Province; Moravian Church in America, Northern Province; Moravian Church in America, Southern Province; Presbyterian Church USA; Protestant Reformed Churches in America; Reformed Church in America; United Church of Christ; United Methodist Church

RCMS denominations included in "other religion": Albanian Orthodox Church in America; Albanian Orthodox Diocese of America; American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church; Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese; Armenian Apostolic Church; Bahai; Bulgarian Orthodox Diocese of the USA; Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints; Community of Christ; Coptic Orthodox Church; Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Vasiloupulis; Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America; Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church of the East; Holy Orthodox Church in North America; Islam; Macedonian Orthodox Church, American Diocese; Orthodox Church in America, Territorial Diocese; Orthodox Church in America, Bulgarian Diocese; Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church, American Diocese; Malankara Archdiocese of the Syrian Orthodox Church; Roman Orthodox Archdiocese in America and Canada; Orthodox Church in America, Romanian Orthodox; Serbian Orthodox Church in the USA; Serbian Orthodox Church in the USA (New Gracanic); Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch; Ukranian Orthodox Church of USA; Unitarian Universalist Association

WORKS CITED

Acock, Alan C. and Vern L. Bengtson. 1980. "Socialization and attribution processes: Actual versus perceived similarity among parents and youth." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 42: 501-515.

Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. 1987. *Bible Believers: Fundamentalists in the Modern World.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Bainbridge, William Sims. 1990. "Explaining the Church Member Rate." *Social Forces* 68(4): 1287-1296.

Barlow, Philip. 2004. "A Demographic Portrait: America Writ Small?" In *Religion and Public Life in the Midwest: America's Common Denominator*. Ed. Philip Barlow and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press. 21-47.

Bartkowski, John P. and Xiaohe Xu. 2000. "Distant Patriarchs or Expressive Dads? The Discourse and Practice of Fathering in Conservative Protestant Families." *Sociological Quarterly* 41(3): 465-485.

Beyerlein, Kraig and John R. Hipp. 2005. "Social Capital, Too Much of a Good Thing? American Religious Traditions and Community Crime." *Social Forces* 84(2): 995-1013.

Byrne, Julie. 2003. *O God of Players: The Story of the Immaculata Might Macs.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Cai, Yi, Johnmarshall Reeve, and Dawn T. Robinson. 2002. "Home-schooling and teaching style: Comparing the motivating styles of home-school and public school teachers." *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 94(2), 372-380.

Carroll, Colleen. 2002. *The New Faithful: Why Young Adults are Embracing Christian Orthodoxy*. Chicago: Loyola Press.

Chalfant, H. Paul and Peter L. Heller. 1991. "Rural/Urban Versus Regional Differences in Religiosity." *Review of Religious Research* 33(1): 76-86.

Chatters, Linda M. and Robert Joseph Taylor. 1988. "Church Members as a Source of Informal Social Support." *Review of Religious Research* 30(2): 193-203.

Cieslak, Michael J. 2005. "The Lack of Consensus Among Catholics for Establishing New Elementary Schools." *Review of Religious Research.* 47(2): 175-189.

Clark, Cynthia A. and Everett L. Worthington, Jr. 1987. "Family variables affecting the transmission of religious values from parents to adolescents: A review." *Family Perspective* 21: 1-21.

Clark, Cynthia A., Everett L. Worthington, Jr. and Donald B. Danser. 1988. "The Transmission of Religious Beliefs and Practices from Parents to Firstborn Early Adolescent Sons." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 50(2): 463-472.

Cochran, J. 1993. "The variable effects of religiosity and denominations on adolescent self-reported alcohol use by beverage type." *Journal of Drug Issues* 23: 479-491.

Collom, Ed. 2005. "The Ins and Outs of Homeschooling: The Determinants of Parental Motivations and Student Achievement." *Education and Urban Society* 37: 307-335.

Davidson, James D., Andrea S. Williams, Richard A. Lamanna, Jan Stenftenagel, Kathleen Maas Weigert, William J. Whalen, and Patricia Wittberg. 1997. *The Search for Common Ground: What Unites and Divides American Catholics*. Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor Publishing Division.

Dolan, Jay P. 1992. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present.* Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Donahue, Michael J. and Peter L. Benson. 1995. "Religion and the well-being of adolescents." *Journal of Social Issues* 51(2): 145-160.

Donelson, Elaine. 1999. "Psychology of religion and adolescents in the United States: Past to present." *Journal of Adolescence* 22: 187-204.

Ebaughs, Helen Rose and Janet Saltzman Chafetz, Eds. 2000. *Religion and the New Immigrants: Continuities and Adaptations in Immigrant Congregations*. Lanham, Maryland: Altamira Press.

Edgell, Penny. 2006. *Religion and Family in a Changing Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Eide, Eric R., Dan D. Goldhaber, and Mark H. Showalter. 2004. "Does Catholic High School Attendance Lead to Attendance at a More Selective College?" *Social Science Quarterly* 85(5): 1335-1352.

Elliott, James R. and Ryan A. Smith. 2001. "Ethnic Matching of Supervisors to Subordinate Work Groups: Findings on 'Bottom-up' Ascription and Social Closure." *Social Problems* 48(2): 258-276.

Ellison, Christopher G. 1994. "Religion, the life-stress paradigm, and the study of depression." In *Religion in aging and health: Theoretical foundations and methodological frontiers*. Ed. J.S. Levin. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage. 78-121.

Emerson, Michael O. and Christian Smith. 2000. *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emerson, Michael O. and Karen Chai Kim. 2003. “Multiracial Congregations: An Analysis of Their Development and a Typology.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42(2): 217-227.

Erickson, Joseph A. 1992. “Adolescent Religious Development and Commitment: A Structural Equation Model of the Role of Family, Peer Group, and Educational Influences.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 31(2): 131-152.

Finke, Roger and Christopher P. Sheitle. 2005. “Accounting for the Uncounted: Computing Correctives for the 2000 RCMS Data.” *Review of Religious Research* 47(1): 5-22.

Finke, Roger and Rodney Stark. 1989. “How the Upstart Sects Won America: 1776-1850.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28(1): 27-44.

Flake, Kathleen. 2004. “The Mormon Corridor: Utah and Idaho.” In *Religion and Public Life in the Mountain West: Sacred Landscapes in Transition*. Ed. Jan Shipps and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press. 91-114.

Gamoran, Adam and Matthew Boxer. 2005. “Religious Participation as Cultural Capital Development: Sector Differences in Chicago’s Jewish Schools.” *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*. 8(4): 440-462.

Gaustad. Edwin S. 1962. “The Geography of American Religion.” *Journal of Bible and Religion* 30(1): 38-45.

Glock, Charles Y. 1962. “On the study of religious commitment.” *Religious Education: Research Supplement* 42: 98-110.

Glock, Charles Y. and Rodney Stark. 1965. *Religion and Society in Tension*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Gorsuch, Richard L. 1988. “Psychology of religion.” *Annual Review of Psychology* 39: 201-221.

Gould, William. 2005. “Computing the Chow statistic.” StataCorp. Accessed online at http://www.stata.com/support/faqs/stat/chow.html in January 2007.

Grammich, Clifford A., Jr. No date. “Swift Growth and Change: The Demography of Southern Catholicism.” Faith & Reason Institute. Accessed online at http://www.frinstitute.org/southern.htm in October 2006.

Granqvist, Pehr. 1998. “Religiousness and Perceived Childhood Attachment: On the Question of Compensation or Correspondence.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 37(2): 350-367.

Greeley, Andrew M. 1969. “Continuities in Research on the ‘Religious Factor.’” *American Journal of Sociology* 75:355-359.

Griswold de Castillo, Richard. 1984. *La Familia*. South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Gunnoe, Marjorie Lindner and Kristin A. Moore. 2002. “Predictors of Religiosity Among Youth Aged 17-22: A Longitudinal Study of the National Survey of Children.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41:613-622.

Hagan, Jacqueline and Helen Rose Ebaugh. 2003. “Calling Upon the Sacred: Migrants’ Use of Religion in the Migration Process.” *International Migration Review* 37(4): 1145-1162.

Harper, Charles L. and Rebecca Schulte-Murray. 1998. “Religion and the Sociology of Culture: Exploring the Organizational Cultures of Two Midwestern Roman Catholic Dioceses.” *Review of Religious Research* 40:101-19.

Harris, Fredrick G. 2001. *Something Within: Religion in African-American Political Activism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hastings, Robert K. and Dean R. Hoge. 1976. “Changes in religion among college students, 1948-1974.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 15: 237-249.

Hernandez, Edwin I. and Roger L. Dudley. 1990. “Persistence of Religion through Primary Group Ties among Hispanic Seventh-Day Adventist Young People.” *Review of Religious Research* 32(2): 157-172.

Himmelfarb, Harold S. 1977. “The Non-Linear Impact of Schooling: Comparing Different Types and Amounts of Jewish Education.” *Sociology of Education* 50(2): 114-132.

Hirschman, Charles. 2004. “The Role of Religion in the Origins and Adaptation of Immigrant Groups in the United States.” *International Migration Review* 38(3): 1206-1233.

Hoffer, Thomas, Andrew M. Greeley, and James S. Coleman. 1985. “Achievement Growth in Public and Catholic Schools.” *Sociology of Education* 58(2): 74-97.

Hoge, Dean R. and Gregory H. Petrillo. 1978. “Determinants of Church Participation and Attitudes of High School Youth.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 17(4): 359-379.

Hoge, Dean R., Gregory H. Petrillo, and Ella I. Smith. 1982. “Transmission of Religious and Social Values from Parents to Teenage Children.” *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 44(3): 569-580.

Howe, George W. 2002. “Integrating family routines and rituals with other family research paradigms: Comment on the special section.” *Journal of Family Psychology* 16: 437-440.

Jensen, Gary F. 1986. “Explaining Differences in Academic Behavior Between Public-School and Catholic-School Students: A Quantitative Case Study.” *Sociology of Education* 59(1): 32-41.

Johnson, Leanor B. and Robert Staples. 2005. *Black Families at the Crossroads: Challenges and Prospects*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jones, Dale E., Doty, Sherri Doty, Clifford Grammich, James E. Horsch, Richard Houseal, Mac Lynn, John P. Marcum, Kenneth M. Sanchagrin, and Richard H. Taylor. 2002. *Religious congregations & membership in the United States 2000 : an enumeration by region, state and county based on data reported for 149 religious bodies*. Nashville, Tennessee: Glenmary Research Center.

Killen, Patricia O’Connell. 2004. “Patterns of the Past, Prospects for the Future: Religion in the None Zone.” In *Religion and Public Life in the Pacific Northwest: The None Zone*. Ed. Patricia O’Connell Killen and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press. 9-20.

King, Morton B. and Richard A. Hunt. 1975. “Measuring the Religious Variable: National Replication.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 14:13-22.

King, Pamela Ebstyne and Chris J. Boyatzis. 2004. “Exploring Adolescent Spiritual and Religious Development: Current and Future Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives.” *Applied Developmental Science* 8(1): 2-6.

Lawton, Leora E. and Regina Bures. 2001. “Parental Divorce and the ‘Switching’ of Religious Identity.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40:99-111.

Lee, Matthew R. and John P. Bartkowski. 2004. “Love Thy Neighbor? Moral Communities, Civic Engagement, and Juvenile Homicide in Rural Areas.” *Social Forces* 82(3): 1001-1035.

Levitt, Peggy. 2007. *God Needs No Passport: Immigrants and the Changing American Religious Landscape*. New York: New Press.

Lincoln, C. Eric and Lawrence H. Mamiya. 1990. *The Black Church in the African American Experience*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Lippy, Charles H. 2005. “Tactics for Survival: Religious Minorities.” In *Religion and Public Life in the South: In the Evangelical Mode*. Ed. Charles Reagan Wilson and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press. 125-140.

Litchfield, Allen W. and Darwin L. Thomas. 1997. “Dimensions of Religiosity as Mediators of the Relations Between Parenting and Adolescent Deviant Behavior.” *Journal of Adolescent Research* 12: 199-226.

Markstrom, Carol A. 1999. “Religious involvement and adolescent psychosocial development.” *Journal of Adolescence* 22: 205-221.

Martin, Todd F., James M. White, and Daniel Perlman. 2003. “Religious Socialization: A Test of the Channeling Hypothesis of Parental Influence on Adolescent Faith Maturity.” *Journal of Adolescent Research* 18(2): 169-187.

Mattis, Jacqueline S. 2001. “Religion and African American Political Life.” *Political Psychology* 22(2): 263-278.

McAdam Doug. 1999. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930 – 1970*. Second edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mirande, Alfredo. 1985. *The Chicano Experience*. South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Morgan, Stephen L. 2001. “Counterfactuals, Causal Effect Heterogeneity, and the Catholic School Effect on Learning.” *Sociology of Education* 74:341-74.

Morrison, James L. and Benjamin J. Hodgkins. 1971. “The Effectiveness of Catholic Education: A Comparative Analysis.” *Sociology of Education* 44(1): 119-131.

Muller, Chandra and Christopher G. Ellison. 2001. “Religious Involvement, Social Capital, and Adolescents’ Academic Progress: Evidence from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988.” *Sociological Focus* 34: 155-183.

Mullins, Larry C., Kimberly P. Brackett, Donald W. Bogie, and Daniel Pruett. 2006. “The Impact of Concentrations of Religious Denominational Affiliations on the Rate of Currently Divorced in Counties in the United States.” *Journal of Family Issues* 27(7): 976-1000.

Neal, Derek. 1997. “Measuring Catholic school performance.” *The Public Interest* 127: 81-87.

Neitz, Mary Jo. 2005. “Reflections on Religion and Place: Rural Churches and American Religion.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 44(3): 243-247.

Noell, Jay. 1982. “Public and Catholic Schools: A Reanalysis of ‘Public and Private Schools.’” *Sociology of Education* 55(2/3): 123-132.

Nudelman, Arthur E. 1971. “Dimensions of Religiosity: A Factor-Analytic View of Protestants, Catholics, and Christian Scientists.” *Review of Religious Research* 13(1): 42-56.

O’Toole, James M. 2004. “Catholics I: Majority Faith with a Minority Mindset.” In *Religion and Public Life in New England: Steady Habits, Changing Slowly*. Ed. Andrew Walsh and Mark Silk.

Ozorak, Elizabeth Weiss. 1989. “Social and Cognitive Influences on the Development of Religious Beliefs and Commitment in Adolescence.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28(4): 448-463.

Pankhurst, Jerry G. and Sharon K. Houseknecht. 2000. “Introduction: The religion-family linkage and social change – a neglected area of study.” In *Family, religion, and social change in diverse societies*. Ed. Sharon K. Houseknecht and Jerry G. Pankhurst. New York: Oxford University Press. 1-40.

Pearce, Lisa D. and William G. Axinn. 1998. “The Impact of Family Religious Life on the Quality of Mother-Child Relations.” *American Sociological Review* 63: 810-828.

Perl, Paul and Mark M. Gray. 2007. “Catholic Schooling and Disaffiliation from Catholicism.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*46(2): 269-280.

Regnerus, Mark D. 2000. “Shaping School Success: A Multi-Level Study of Religious Socialization and Educational Outcomes in Urban Public Schools.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 39: 363-370.

Regnerus, Mark D. 2003. “Religion and Positive Adolescent Outcomes: A Review of Research and Theory.” *Review of Religious Research* 44(4): 394-413.

Regnerus, Mark D. and Glen H. Elder. 2003. “Staying on Track in School: Religious Influences in High and Low Risk Settings.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42(4): 633-649.

Regnerus, Mark D., Christian Smith, and Brad Smith. 2004. “Social Context in the Development of Adolescent Religiosity.” *Applied Developmental Science* 8(1): 27-38.

Satterthwaite, Shad. 2005. “Faster Horses, Older Whiskey, and More Money: An Analysis of Religious Influence on Referenda Voting.” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 44(1): 105-112.

Sikkink, David. 1999. “The Social Sources of Alienation from Public Schools.” *Social Forces* 78(1): 51-86.

Silberstein, Richard, Jonathan Rabinowitz, Paul Ritterband, and Barry Kosmin. 1987. "Giving to Jewish Philanthropic Causes: A Preliminary Reconnaissance." Working Paper. New York: North American Jewish Data Bank, City University of New York.

Sloane, Douglas M. and Raymond H. Potvin. 1983. "Age Differences in Adolescent Religiousness." *Review of Religious Research* 25:142-154.

Smith, Christian. 1998. *American Evangelicals: Embattled and Thriving*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Christian. 2003. "Theorizing Religious Effects Among American Adolescents." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42(1): 17-30.

Smith, Christian and Melinda Lundquist Denton. 2005. *Soul Searching: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of American Teenagers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Christian and Phillip Kim. 2003a. *Family Religious Involvement and the Quality of Family Relationships for Early Adolescents.* Chapel Hill, North Carolina: National Study of Youth and Religion.

Smith, Christian and Phillip Kim. 2003b. *Family Religious Involvement and the Quality of Parental Relationships for Families with Early Adolescents*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: National Study of Youth and Religion.

Smith, Christian, David Sikkink, and Jason Bailey. 1998. "Devotion in Dixie and Beyond: A Test of the 'Shibley Thesis' on the Effects of Regional Origin and Migration on Individual Religiosity." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 37(3): 494-506.

Smith, Christian and David Sikkink. 2000. "Evangelicals on Education." In *Christian America?: What Evangelicals Really Want.* Ed. Christian Smith. Berkeley: University of California Press. 129-159.

Smith, Christian and David Sikkink. 2003. "Social Predictors of Retention in and Switching from the Religious Faith of Family of Origin: Another Look Using Religious Tradition Self-Identification." *Review of Religious Research* 45(2): 188-206.

Stark, Rodney. 1996. "Religion as Context: Hellfire and Delinquency One More Time." *Sociology of Religion* 57(2): 163-173.

Stark, Rodney. 1998. "Catholic Contexts: Competition, Commitment, and Innovation." *Review of Religious Research* 39(3): 197-208.

Stark, Rodney. 2002. "Physiology and Faith: Addressing the "Universal" Gender Difference in Religious Commitment." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 41: 495-507.

Steensland, Brian, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces*, 79 (1): 291-318.

Tweed, Thomas A. 1997. *Our Lady of the Exile: Diasporic Religion at a Cuban Catholic Shrine in Miami*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wallace, John M., Jr. and David R. Williams. 1997. "Religion and adolescent health-compromising behavior." *Health risks and developmental transitions during adolescence*. Eds. John Schulenberg, Jennifer L. Maggs, and Klaus Hurrelmann. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 444-468.

Walsh, Andrew. 2004. "Religion in New England: Reckoning with Catholicism." In *Religion and Public Life in New England: Steady Habits, Changing Slowly*. Ed. Andrew Walsh and Mark Silk. Walnut Creek, California: Altamira Press. 11-17.

Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Translated and edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, 3 volumes. New York: Bedminster.

Whitehead, Barbara Dafoe, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Sharon Scales Rostosky. 2001. *Keeping the faith: The role of religious and faith communities in preventing teen pregnancy*. Washington, DC: National Campaign to Prevent Teen Pregnancy.

Wilcox, W. Bradford. 2004. *Soft Patriarchs, New Men: How Christianity Shapes Fathers and Husbands*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Willms, J. Douglas. 1985. "Catholic-School Effects on Academic Achievement: New Evidence from the High School and Beyond Follow-Up Study." *Sociology of Education* 58(2): 98-114.

Zalenski, Peter A. and Charles E. Zech. 1995. "The Effect of Religious Market Competition on Religious Giving." *Review of Social Economy* 53: 350-367.